

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**POMEGRANATE COMMUNICATIONS,
INC.,**

Plaintiff,

v.

SOURCEBOOKS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:19-cv-0119-AC

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge John Acosta issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on December 13, 2019. ECF 21. Magistrate Judge Acosta recommended that Plaintiff's Complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim with leave to amend the Complaint. Judge Acosta found that Plaintiff had not adequately pleaded facts that consumers would expect use of "Women Who Dare" in a book title, without more, to identify Plaintiff as the source of the book. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review *de novo* magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Acosta’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Acosta’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 20. Defendant’s motion to dismiss (ECF 10) is GRANTED, and Plaintiff’s Complaint is dismissed with leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 3rd day of January, 2020.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge